

sored life insurance or to use this allotment provision.

In view of the action of the Armed Services Committee and in view of the amendments made by them, the Veterans' Affairs Committee is prepared at this time to accept S. 383 as reported as an amendment to the Veterans' Insurance Act of 1974.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Alabama.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 6574, that H.R. 6574 be made the pending business, and that the text of S. 1835, as amended, be substituted for the text of H.R. 6574.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

H.R. 6574 will be stated by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 6574) to amend title 38, United States Code, to encourage persons to join and remain in the Reserves and National Guard by providing full-time coverage under Servicemen's Group Life Insurance for such members and certain members of the Retired Reserve, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the House bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all after the enacting clause in H.R. 6574 be stricken, and that the text of S. 1835, as amended, be substituted in lieu thereof.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on the engrossment of the amendment.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that S. 1835 and S. 383 be indefinitely postponed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, H.R. 6574, as amended, is now the pending business and we have proceeded to the point where we have had third reading. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, the provisions of S. 383 were added to S. 1835, and then the House bill was brought up.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is correct.

Mr. ALLEN. I do not recall hearing the provisions of S. 1835, as amended, added as a substitute for H.R. 6574.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It was a part of the unanimous consent request.

Mr. ALLEN. Very well, I thank the Chair.

FEDERAL ELECTION CAMPAIGN ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1974

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill (S. 3044) to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to provide for public financing of primary and general election campaigns for Federal elective office, and to amend certain other provisions of law relating to the financing and conduct of such campaigns.

IDENTIFICATION OF TAX-SUPPORTED POLITICAL ADVERTISEMENTS

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, if campaigns for Federal office are to become federally financed projects like housing developments, highways, and flood control levees then they deserve to be accorded the same treatment. Therefore, I am introducing an amendment to the so-called public financing bill that will require tax-supported political materials to be clearly identified and called to the attention of the American people.

My amendment requires that any candidate for Congress, the Senate, President or Vice President who accepts Federal tax funds for his campaign shall print on all of his campaign literature, advertisements, bumper stickers, billboards, or matchbooks a clear notice that they are paid for with tax money.

The Federal Government has developed a very useful policy of identifying tax-supported projects, usually by means of a billboard or sign erected on the project site. Frequently, these notices give the total cost of the project, the Federal share, the local or State share, and a brief description of the project. Perhaps such great detail would not be practical in the case of tax-supported political campaigns, but the principle is valid. So if the Congress is going to turn itself and the entire electoral system into a massive Federal grant-in-aid program, it is entirely fitting and proper that the American people be shown how their tax dollars are being spent.

If candidate X is going to be given so many hundreds of thousands of dollars from the U.S. Treasury, then I believe the American people are entitled to see the fruits of their tax dollars clearly identified. It would be no great inconvenience to tax-supported candidates to include such a notice on their bumper stickers, their buttons, their newspaper ads, and so forth. And I believe the public has a right to be advised of such expenditures.

My amendment requiring this identification is simple and straightforward and it would certainly provide more immediate and valuable information on campaign expenditures to the average taxpayer than some obscure bookkeeping entry in one of the many reports required of political candidates.

When Mr. and Mrs. Taxpayer see their tax dollars being spent on candidate X's billboards, candidate Y's newspaper advertisements and candidate Z's yard

signs, it will give them a much clearer idea about the flow of their taxes and the uses to which they are put.

So I would hope the Senate will adopt this amendment and urge my colleagues to do so. The American people should see where their taxes go, and Federal projects—whether dams or bridges or foreign aid or political campaigns—should be identified.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question for the purpose of legislative history?

Mr. DOLE. I yield.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Of course, I wish there would be some indication that this notice had to be in large readable print, and I think the intention would be it could not be in small print.

Mr. DOLE. No, it could not be larger than your name, of course, but the public should be able to read it.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Would it be acceptable to have a rubber stamp, so they could stamp across the literature, "Paid for with Governments funds."

Mr. DOLE. That would be appropriate.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I thank the Senator. That clarifies the question.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute simply to point out that the statement itself calls for a false statement. A person elected under title I in the primary campaign would be entitled only to 50-percent matching funds. Therefore, the statement on the billboard or in television advertising or in newspaper advertising or in the brochures he puts out that it is paid for by public financing only would be in error. It would be paid for only in part by public funds if he elected to take advantage of title I.

I think what we are seeing here is a filibuster by amendment, and this is just another one.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I am not part of a filibuster. I voted for cloture, as the Senator knows. I had in my original amendment "paid for in whole or in part by Federal tax funds." I think that is the intent. If only 50 percent was paid for in tax funds, the statement would contain "only 50 percent," but I did not know how to draft that or how much each of us would take. At least, for legislative history, that would be the intent and the hope.

I could perhaps modify my amendment to show the percentage of the tax funds.

I ask consent to have the modification made to the effect that, if it is not paid for wholly by tax funds, the part that is shown.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Who yields time?

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I am prepared to yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Kansas have his amendment sent to the desk?

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I would also point out that the percentage could be different in every instance, because one person may take advantage of it to

the extent of 50 percent, and another person may take advantage of it to the extent of 20 percent. It relates to the amount of funds he is able to raise for the purpose of matching, so it could be different in every instance. It is a very bad amendment.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, the Senator from Nevada is entitled to his opinion, but I believe my amendment is entirely appropriate. I might say, as a matter of clarification, to avoid that possibility, I have gone back to the original language of the amendment, which I think would clarify it.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, may I ask that the clerk read the modified amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the amendment as modified.

The second assistant legislative clerk proceeded to read the amendment, as modified.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment, as modified, is as follows:

On page 39, between lines 20 and 21 insert the following new subsection:

"(c) Any published political advertisement of a candidate electing to receive payments under Title I of this Act shall contain on the face or front page thereof the following notice:

"Paid for in whole or in part by Federal tax funds."

On page 39, line 21 strike out "(c)" and insert in lieu thereof "(d)".

On page 40, line 3, strike out "(d)" and insert in lieu thereof "(e)".

On page 40, line 8, strike out "(d)" and insert in lieu thereof "(e)".

On page 40, line 11, strike out "(e)" and insert in lieu thereof "(f)".

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, before I yield back the remainder of my time, let me say that, as the Senator pointed out correctly, he voted for cloture the other day. I hope he does so tomorrow.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time having been yielded back, the question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. DOLE), as modified. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The second assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. I announce that the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BAYH), the Senator from Texas (Mr. BENTSEN), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CHURCH), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. EASTLAND), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. FULBRIGHT), the Senator from Alaska (Mr. GRAVEL), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. HOLLINGS), the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HUGHES), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. LONG), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. MCGEE), and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. METZENBAUM) are necessarily absent.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I announce that the Senator from Utah (Mr. BENNETT), the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. FONG), the Senator from Florida (Mr. GURNEY), the Senator from New York (Mr. JAVITS), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. MCCLURE), the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. BROCK), and the Senator from New York (Mr. BUCKLEY) are necessarily absent.

I also announce that the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. BELLMON), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WILLIAM L. SCOTT), and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. TAFT) are absent on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 30, nays 48, as follows:

[No. 123 Leg.]

YEAS—30

Allen	Ervin	Packwood
Baker	Fannin	Percy
Bartlett	Goldwater	Randolph
Biden	Griffin	Ribicoff
Byrd	Hansen	Talmadge
Harry F., Jr.	Helms	Thurmond
Byrd, Robert C.	Hruska	Tower
Cotton	Mansfield	Weicker
Curtis	McClellan	Young
Dole	McIntyre	
Dominick	Nunn	

NAYS—48

Abourezk	Haskell	Nelson
Aiken	Hatfield	Pastore
Beall	Hathaway	Pearson
Bible	Huddleston	Pell
Brooke	Humphrey	Proxmire
Burdick	Inouye	Roth
Cannon	Jackson	Schweiker
Case	Johnston	Scott, Hugh
Chiles	Magnuson	Sparkman
Clark	Mathias	Stafford
Cook	McGovern	Stennis
Cranston	Metcalf	Stevens
Domenici	Mondale	Stevenson
Eagleton	Montoya	Symington
Hart	Moss	Tunney
Hartke	Muskie	Williams

NOT VOTING—22

Bayh	Fong	Long
Bellmon	Fulbright	McClure
Bennett	Gravel	McGee
Bentsen	Gurney	Metzenbaum
Brook	Hollings	Scott,
Buckley	Hughes	William L.
Church	Javits	Taft
Eastland	Kennedy	

So Mr. DOLE's amendment, as modified, was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if I may have the attention of the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that on the vote which will follow immediately, there be a time limitation of 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That will be the last vote tonight. I understand that the distinguished Senator from Alabama will call up an amendment which will be the pending business tomorrow. At this time, I ask unanimous consent that there be a time limitation of 1 hour on the Allen amendment to be called up, the time to be equally divided between and controlled by the sponsor of the amendment, the distinguished Senator from Alabama (Mr. ALLEN), and the manager of the bill, the distinguished Senator from Nevada (Mr. CANNON).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, the amendment is No. 1141, and it would re-

duce the overall amount that can be expended very greatly.

The printed amendment by that number has certain figures in it; I ask unanimous consent that I may modify those figures slightly, even though the time limitation has been agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment, as modified, is as follows:

On page 13, line 23, strike out "10 cents" and insert in lieu thereof "8 cents".

On page 15, line 9, strike out "15 cents" and insert in lieu thereof "12 cents".

Mr. MANSFIELD. Does the Senator request the yeas and nays?

Mr. ALLEN. Yes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order at this time to order the yeas and nays on the Allen amendment which will be called up.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. HARTKE. Will there be a rollcall vote now on the insurance bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

VETERANS INSURANCE ACT OF 1974

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill H.R. 6574 to amend title 38, United States Code, to increase the maximum amount of Servicemen's Group Life Insurance to \$20,000, to provide full-time coverage thereunder for certain members of the Reserves and National Guard, to authorize the conversion of such insurance to Veterans' Group Life Insurance, and for other purposes.

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. Is H.R. the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending business now is H.R. 6574 as amended.

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. As amended by what?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. As amended by the substantive language of S. 383 and S. 1835.

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. A further parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. Am I correct in my understanding, then, that S. 1835 and S. 383 have been added to the House bill, or do they take the place of the House bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. They have replaced the language in the House bill.

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. Insofar as the substance of S. 383 is concerned, it has not changed and there is no cost to the Government involved in that amendment?

Mr. ALLEN. We are taking it back as it came from the Senate committee.

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. I thank the Senator from Alabama and the Senator from Montana, and I thank the Chair.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the names of the following Senators who were cosponsors of S. 383 be added to the amendment which the Senator from Alabama offered to S. 1835: Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. DOLZ, Mr. THURMOND, and Mr. STENNIS.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I rise in support of H.R. 6574 as amended, the Veterans' Insurance Act of 1974.

Basically, this legislation serves four purposes.

First, it would provide servicemen's group life insurance—SGLI—for the Ready Reserve and National Guard on a full-time basis.

Second, it would provide veterans group life insurance—VGLI—to veterans for a 5 year nonrenewable period.

Third, the maximum amount of SGLI or VGLI which may be purchased would be increased from \$15,000 to \$20,000.

Fourth, veterans' special term life insurance would be made a participating policy.

Mr. President, this legislation was cosponsored by all members of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, and after extensive hearings by the Subcommittee on Housing and Insurance, was unanimously reported on March 1, 1974.

Presently, SGLI is extended only to those on active duty or active duty for training under a call or order to duty that specifies a period of less than 31 days, during scheduled inactive duty training, and while traveling to and from such duties.

Much has been said about the necessity to make service in the Reserves and National Guard more attractive, and to encourage persons to join and remain in the Reserve components of our Armed Forces. This is of particular importance in light of the volunteer Army concept.

The provision for full-time SGLI coverage for the Ready Reserves and National Guard will provide an additional incentive for the recruit or member of the National Guard to join and remain in a unit.

Mr. President, the provision for a non-renewable 5-year term policy known as veterans group life insurance is a good one. VGLI would become effective on the day SGLI terminates, and after 5 years, could be converted by the veteran with a commercial insurer.

Presently, the veteran must convert his SGLI policy, if he desires, within a 120-day period after discharge, or lose his right to conversion.

This provision will enhance the readjustment process for our young veterans. It will allow them a conversion opportunity when they are more financially able to convert their policy with a commercial insurer.

The veterans special term life insurance program was authorized for Korean conflict veterans, but paid no dividends.

The VSLI provision will return excessive premiums to those veterans, instead of having the amount in excess of mortality claims revert to the Treasury.

Finally, the maximum amount of coverage under SGLI and VGLI would increase from \$15,000 to \$20,000.

The average ownership of insurance is in excess of \$25,000 for each insured family. I am convinced that these provisions go a long way toward assuring the young veteran adequate protection for his family while he is trying to readjust to the civilian economy.

Since both SGLI and VGLI are self-supporting programs, the cost impact is a minimal administrative cost. An estimated cost of \$6 million would be involved in the return of dividends to the Korean veterans on the veterans' special life insurance policies.

I believe that the Veterans Insurance Act will have a positive effect on both the uniformed services insurance programs and on VA insurance programs.

Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to give this legislation their most careful consideration.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, I rise in support of H.R. 6574 as amended, a bill relating to insurance provided for members of the armed services.

This bill has four parts which should be beneficial to many individuals, both those on active duty and veterans who have been separated from service.

The first portion of this bill will provide Servicemen's Group Life Insurance—SGLI—to all members of the Reserves and National Guard.

It will increase the coverage of all personnel from \$15,000 to \$20,000. This is in line with the coverage of the average American citizen. It also should serve as an inducement to young men to enlist and remain in the Reserve or National Guard programs.

The bill will provide conversion coverage to individuals who were discharged during the 5 years preceding enactment of this bill who did not convert their Servicemen's Group Life Insurance within 120 days.

It provides fulltime coverage for Reservists and National Guard members who have retired but who are not eligible for retirement benefits until the age of 60.

The last provision of S. 1835 authorizes the payment of dividends on Veterans' Special Term Life Insurance—VSLI—issued prior to December 31, 1956.

The premiums charged on this type insurance are in excess of the actuarial costs. I am sure Congress never intended that any overcharge made on this insurance should be used to offset charges of another type Government insurance.

The Department of Defense, as well as all veterans' organizations, favor this legislation.

In light of these facts, I respectfully urge the support of my colleagues for this legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill (H.R. 6574) having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass? On this question, the yeas and nays have

been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The second assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. I announce that the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BAYH), the Senator from Texas (Mr. BENTSEN), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CHURCH), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. EASTLAND), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. FULBRIGHT), the Senator from Alaska (Mr. GRAVEL), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. HOLLINGS), the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HUGHES), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. LONG), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. MCGEE), and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. METZENBAUM) are necessarily absent.

I further announce that if present and voting, the Senator from Ohio (Mr. METZENBAUM), and the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. FULBRIGHT) would each vote "yea."

Mr. GRIFFIN. I announce that the Senator from Utah (Mr. BENNETT), the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. BROCK), the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. FONG), the Senator from Florida (Mr. GURNEY), the Senator from New York (Mr. JAVITS), and the Senator from Idaho (Mr. MCCLURE) are necessarily absent.

I also announce that the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. BELLMON), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WILLIAM L. SCOTT), and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. TAFT) are absent on official business.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. FONG) would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 79, nays 0, as follows:

[No. 124 Leg.]
YEAS—79

Abourezk	Fannin	Nelson
Aiken	Goldwater	Nunn
Allen	Griffin	Packwood
Baker	Hansen	Pastore
Bartlett	Hart	Pearson
Beall	Hartke	Pell
Bible	Haskell	Percy
Biden	Hatfield	Proxmire
Brooke	Hathaway	Randolph
Buckley	Helms	Ribicoff
Burdick	Hruska	Roth
Byrd	Huddleston	Schweiker
Harry F., Jr.	Humphrey	Scott, Hugh
Byrd, Robert C.	Inouye	Sparkman
Cannon	Jackson	Stafford
Case	Johnston	Stennis
Chiles	Magnuson	Stevens
Clark	Mansfield	Stevenson
Cook	Mathias	Symington
Cotton	McClellan	Talmadge
Cranston	McGovern	Thurmond
Curtis	McIntyre	Tower
Dole	Metcalf	Tunney
Domenici	Mondale	Welcker
Dominick	Montoya	Williams
Eagleton	Moss	Young
Ervin	Muskie	

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—21

Bayh	Fulbright	McClure
Bellmon	Gravel	McGee
Bennett	Gurney	Metzenbaum
Bentsen	Hollings	Scott,
Brock	Hughes	William L.
Church	Javits	Taft
Eastland	Kennedy	
Fong	Long	

So the bill (H.R. 6574) was passed.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I move to reconsider—

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, if the Senator will withhold that for a moment, until we get the title amended, I have an amendment at the desk and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ABUREZK). The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Amend the title by adding the words: "and to authorize allotments from the pay of members of the National Guard of the United States for group life insurance premiums."

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, this is merely an amendment to the title to cover the provisions of S-383 added to the bill, and I ask that it be agreed to.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Secretary of the Senate be authorized to make technical and clerical corrections in the engrossment of the Senate amendments to H.R. 6574.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the bill was passed be reconsidered.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR GOLDWATER

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. Mr. President, the New York Times magazine for yesterday, April 7, 1974, has published a most interesting article on one of our colleagues. It is entitled "The Liberals Love Barry Goldwater Now." It was written by Roy Reed who is chief Southern correspondent for the New York Times.

Mr. President, I have read this article very carefully. It seems to be an objective piece of reporting. Those of us who know BARRY GOLDWATER know what a wonderful, warmhearted, courageous individual he is. We know how outspoken he is, a characteristic that the people of this country increasingly like in their public officials.

A little while ago, a Senator mentioned to me, in talking about this article, that if we are not careful, both major parties may wind up their conventions by nominating BARRY GOLDWATER in 1976.

Well, Mr. President, I am not promoting any candidacies at all, but I do think that, in justice to BARRY GOLDWATER, some of his views were misrepresented in earlier years. It is most appropriate that this article written by Roy Reed in the New York Times magazine be printed in the RECORD, and I ask unanimous consent that that be done.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE LIBERALS LOVE BARRY GOLDWATER NOW
(By Roy Reed)

The smell of facism has been in the air at this convention.—DREW PEARSON at the Republican National Convention in San Francisco, 1964.

Goldwaterism has come to stand for nuclear irresponsibility.—From a staff letter written for Gov. William W. Scranton of Pennsylvania, an unsuccessful candidate for

the 1964 Republican Presidential nomination.

I think the Republican party platform plus Goldwater is a prescription for World War III.—NORMAN THOMAS, the Socialist leader, 1964.

I've often said that if I hadn't known Barry Goldwater in 1964 and I had to depend on the press and the cartoons, I'd have voted against the son of a bitch.—Senator BARRY M. GOLDWATER, the 1964 Republican Presidential nominee, in an interview Oct. 30, 1973.

So many unsettling things have happened lately that it is hard to remember what a menace the Senator from Arizona was in 1964. Recollect a little longer on how fearsome it was during that emotional Presidential election campaign. There was George Meany (before Meany's fall from grace over Vietnam, and long before his rehabilitation as a leader of the Nixon impeachers) warning us of "a parallel between Senator Barry Goldwater and Adolf Hitler." While Drew Pearson was reporting the smell of fascism, Gov. Edmund G. Brown of California was picking up "the stench of fascism." The Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. saw "dangerous signs of Hitlerism in the Goldwater campaign." Even President Lyndon B. Johnson warned us that his opponent was "a raving, ranting demagogue."

Now it is time to celebrate the decennial of our escape from Goldwaterism and a peculiar thing has happened. The man who was the villain in 1964 has become a hero. In fact, he is one of the few political heroes left alive in the United States. And, most puzzling, he seems to be almost as well-loved by those who once feared and despised him as he is by those who have always loved him.

The astonishing new popularity of Barry Goldwater beyond the conservative wing of the Republican party is generally attributed to his blunt talk on Watergate during the last year. Of all the Republicans, he has been the most fearless in needling and prodding his Republican President. He has repeatedly urged Mr. Nixon to tell the truth and when the President has failed to satisfy him he has publicly raised doubts about the President's honesty. He has admitted that Watergate will hurt his party in the coming elections, and he has said he does not blame any Republican who feels he has to put distance between himself and his party's leader when he approaches his constituents.

But Watergate is not the whole story of Barry Goldwater's new standing. Evidence of his rehabilitation could be seen well before Watergate as he visited college campuses and got enthusiastic welcomes from people whose 1964 memories were of Halloween and grade school, not politics. Now it appears that it was also taking place at the same time in the subconscious minds of millions of liberal Democrats who voted against him in 1964 but who, undeliberately and perhaps unconsciously, somewhere along the way lost their fear of him, and their rancor.

Maybe it is time for liberals to ask themselves some questions. Were we wrong about Goldwater in 1964? Was he a bad guy, or were we sold a bill of goods? What has happened since then to make him acceptable? Has he changed, or has the country changed? Or, God help us, have the liberals changed? If we were deceived in 1964, what is the chance that we are being deceived again in 1974?

What difference does it make—someone will ask. Isn't Barry Goldwater merely a Senator from Arizona now, defanged and harmless? Maybe so. But a funny thing happened on his way to becoming every liberal's favorite conservative, as someone put it. He is now the Dwight D. Eisenhower of the Republican party. As an elder and now respectable statesman, his voice will be listened to for a long time. There is even talk of his

running for President again; he is not taken in by such talk, but he knows its value.

I am one of the few national reporters who have never covered Goldwater. When I walked into his office not long ago, on the first of two visits, the only baggage I carried was a faded, 10-year-old suspicion of the man and a crisp new amazement at the rehabilitation he had undergone. The first things I noticed as I waited in his outer office were the famous airplane and automobile models that he had made or acquired over the years. There was a 1930 Alfa Romeo named—for his wife—"The Peggy G," built by Barry Goldwater, 1973, as the plaque said. I smiled at my 1964 memories. Goldwater the tinkerer. Goldwater the political lightweight. Next the pictures. Paintings of Indians. Sensitive photographs of Indians. One was a likeness of an old man, and the picture seemed to show all there is in the human face of experience and strength and mildness. I learned later that Goldwater had taken some of the pictures. I did not know that at the time but before I stepped into his inner office I was aware that he had established a beachhead in my mind.

It is always necessary in political writing to say that the politician looked either tan and fit or pale and tired. Mr. Goldwater looked tan and fit. I told him at some point, when he was talking about the disadvantage of running for President at his age, that he didn't look 65. He said he knew it.

"But when you try to put an older man on the television tube," he said, "it's just damned hard to do. The younger voters, the young women particularly, will see a guy with wrinkles all over his face and then some young buck stands up and—'Gee, this guy, for me!'"

But that was much later. He began by remembering the 1964 election: "The size of the vote that Johnson got was a bit of a surprise, but it didn't bug me; it didn't stay with me. When you've lost an election by that much, it isn't a case of whether you made the wrong speech or wore the wrong necktie. It just was the wrong time."

How does he feel now about Lyndon Johnson, the great rival of his life? "Lyndon and I were always friends. And I knew his shortcomings just as he knew mine. I never felt unkindly toward him. He never really—he never did anything uncalled for in our campaign. I think a few remarks he made about me were remarks made in the heat of a campaign that he probably regretted. I saw him once or twice, three or four times, after the election. I tried to give him advice on South Vietnam, which he wouldn't take, and I tried to tell him to get rid of Robert McNamara, which he finally did and admitted that he should have done it sooner. No, I always felt very kindly disposed toward Lyndon. He was a power man. He used power. In fact, he used power in everything that he did. I didn't particularly appreciate that, 'cause I think you can catch more flies with honey than you can banging at 'em.'"

I had already talked to several people about the phenomenon of Mr. Goldwater's burial and resurrection and I had been offered numerous explanations for it, ranging from sociological to supernatural. One of the more persuasive had come from Senator J. William Fulbright of Arkansas, an early Goldwater adversary in the Senate. Mr. Fulbright recalled that Mr. Goldwater in 1964 had advocated widening the Vietnam war by bombing Hanoi, mining Haiphong harbor and other measures, while President Johnson during that election year had protested that he would never send American boys to fight a war that Asian boys should be fighting. "Later, it appeared that that was a deception, that Lyndon Johnson intended all along to widen the war; so there's been a reaction. The misjudgment of Lyndon Johnson tends to carry over to where we were unfair to

Barry Goldwater, because Lyndon Johnson did even more than Barry Goldwater said he would do."

It is easy, as Mr. Fulbright acknowledges, to look back and see where we were headed. What is not quite clear is why we so stubbornly refused to read the signs that were given. In *The Times* of July 15, 1964, the day Mr. Goldwater won the Presidential nomination at San Francisco, a page-one story from Washington reported that the Johnson Administration was sending 300 more Green Berets to South Vietnam as "advisers." "Thus the withdrawals that were set in motion last Christmas when 1,000 of 16,500 men were withdrawn have been reversed," the story said.

Senator Goldwater does not agree that President Johnson followed his policy on Vietnam. He still believes it was a mistake to rely so heavily on ground troops. He said he told Mr. Johnson soon after the 1964 election, "You've got to bomb the living hell out of them. In fact, we've got to carry this war to North Vietnam and right to Hanoi itself if you're going to be successful, and that would include the mining of Haiphong." He believes the war would have ended much sooner, and without having to send large numbers of ground troops, if Mr. Johnson had taken his advice.

But the point is the same. We were deceived by Lyndon Johnson, and the deception somewhat legitimized the Goldwater war policy. No matter that he might have been as mistaken as Johnson, or that his policy might have been even more disastrous. Johnson took Goldwater off the hook and made possible, perhaps even inevitable, his eventual re-election.

That would have sounded preposterous during the campaign of 1964. Remember, we were opposing a right-wing zealot who had pledged "victory" over Communism. There was not enough room in the world for both democracy and Communism, he had warned; and since he had also spoken of the desirability of "brinkmanship" and the need for courage in using nuclear weapons as a threat against the Russians, it seemed obvious where he would take us if he became President. And it was not just his foreign-policy views that frightened us. Congress, under the Johnson lash, had finally passed a civil-rights law with teeth. Mr. Goldwater had voted against it, calling it unconstitutional. Every black leader of any stature lined up against the Goldwater candidacy. Jackie Robinson became chairman of "Republicans for Johnson."

When there were Social Security, which Goldwater wanted to abolish—remember?—and the Tennessee Valley Authority, which he wanted to sell. It was easy to be frightened. Goldwater had made thousands of spoken and written statements on everything he could think of, hundreds of off-the-cuff wisecracks that pleased audiences, titillated reporters and alarmed his staff.

His votes on legislation, when he had bothered to come in from the lecture circuit long enough to vote, were almost entirely against large public expenditures of any kind, against Federal aid to education, against foreign aid, against farm subsidies, against the Rural Electrification Administration—in short, against almost every group or idea that had had a claim on the liberal conscience since the days of Franklin D. Roosevelt.

If finding the Goldwater weaknesses was possible for a novice like me in 1964, it was child's play for a political intellectual like J. W. Fulbright. Poking fun at "The Conscience of a Conservative," the title of Goldwater's book, Mr. Fulbright told the Senate on the one-month anniversary of Mr. Goldwater's nomination, "A peculiar problem arises from the fact that while Senator Goldwater is himself of conservative disposition, his conscience clearly is not. It is in fact, an

unruly conscience demanding intermittently that we break off diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union, or that we impose a Western protectorate on the newly independent peoples of Africa, or that we balance the Federal budget while at the same time abolish in the graduated income tax and sawing off the Eastern seaboard—with all its valuable tax money—and letting it float out to sea."

Picking holes in Goldwater was easy. It was also perilous. Consider the way the public impressions were built, brick by brick: He was making a speech like thousands of speeches he had made since he had soared into the national scene on the winds of Arizona in 1952; the audience was the Captive Nations rally being held at San Francisco during the Republican National Convention of 1964: "I am not one of those naive people who think you can live with your enemy, particularly when he has sworn to bury you."

Perfect Goldwater. Any American over 30 will remember that line, or one like it. It is part of his "victory over Communism" speech, and it calls up memories of other fighting words: "nuclear superiority," "brinkmanship." But how many remember the lines that came next: "Nor am I a warmonger who believes that the only way to stop Communism is with bombs or bullets. I don't believe you can stop any idea by killing people, but only with a better idea." That, too, was a regular theme in the Goldwater speeches. But who would remember it when it was buried under "bombs" and "victory" and "brinkmanship"?

It was the same with civil rights. He was accused of having allowed himself to be captured by racists and reactionaries, and he had. But in the hubbub his private views were lost. It was reported in *The Times*—the same week it reported the Captive Nations speech—that Mr. Goldwater had addressed the Florida delegation at the convention, calling on Gov. George C. Wallace to step out of the race to avoid splitting the Southern vote, but also telling his Southern audience that segregation was wrong—"morally and in some instances constitutionally." He went on to say that he would use the moral power of the Presidency to end discrimination and that he would enforce the 1964 civil-rights law, even though he had voted against it.

Probably the only things that are generally remembered now about Goldwater and the race issue in 1964 are that the Congress of Racial Equality demonstrated outside the Cow Palace during the Republican convention and that the Negro delegates on the inside threatened to walk out to protest his policies. That so one-sided and negative a recollection should have survived may be the proper comeuppance for a man who lets himself be used by evil men.

But what of us who allow ourselves to be used by good men? Mr. Goldwater made a speech in New Hampshire one day in 1964 in which he suggested a voluntary system for Social Security. He said those who wanted to stay in the system should be able to do so and those who preferred to provide for their own retirement should be able to get out. A headline in a New Hampshire newspaper the next day said, "Goldwater Sets Goals: and End Social Security, Hit Castro." The inaccurate headline was followed by considerable reporting around the country attempting to clarify what Goldwater had actually said. I have no doubt that I learned the truth of the matter in 1964, before the incident faded from sight. Why, then, do you suppose that 10 years later my memory was still willing to believe that Barry Goldwater had advocated abolishing Social Security?

I think I know the answer: (1) The Democrats, who had my sympathy in 1964, insisted that I believe the worst about Senator Goldwater, even if it meant believing that he was a political monster, and (2) like the girl in

"Oklahoma" who couldn't say no, I wanted to believe the worst about him. Thus the stage was set for my memory, 10 years later, to try to tell me something that I had once known to be a lie.

If his enemies distorted Mr. Goldwater in the public mind that year, they were not alone in the endeavor. Mr. Goldwater did all he could to add to the confusion. In a way, he really was a frightening public figure. He was continually giving answers off the top of his head to the most serious questions. His spontaneity had a dual effect. To his friends, he was candid and refreshing; to his enemies, he was insane and dangerous. One wonders how an impartial observer would characterize his going to Tennessee to argue that the Federal Government should sell the Tennessee Valley Authority.

I did not ask him if he had any regrets about his conduct of the 1964 campaign because I figured he would say no. It is almost as hard to admit regret as it is to admit error. But one of his comments was revealing. I said it was interesting that he still had a large following nine years after his defeat for President, while Senator George McGovern's following had apparently melted away within nine months. He said that was because Mr. McGovern had left his party.

But isn't that what people said about Goldwater in 1964? Yes, but it was not true, he said. Then he talked of the extremist image that had cost him so much support in his own party. "I think in my acceptance speech"—he hesitated as if trying to remember the words—"when I said something like, uh—'extremism in the defense of liberty is no vice . . .,' well, this became a great tool for the Republicans to leave me. I guess I lost between six and eight million Republicans who looked on me as radical, or conservative, almost Fascist-bent. Because you've got the spectrum: To the complete right is Fascism, complete left is Communism, and there's not much difference. So that was the way I was painted. But I got 27 million votes and I don't think I've lost many of them, frankly, since that time. And I know from personal contacts that many of these Republicans have become my friends. For example, Agnew was completely opposed to me, and yet I'm his biggest defender. Rockefeller was completely opposed to me, yet we're very close friends now." (His defense of former Vice President Agnew is merely on procedural grounds. He believes the White House and the Justice Department wronged Agnew by trying his case in the press before formal charges were filed. He also thinks Mr. Agnew would not have pleaded guilty to income-tax fraud if he had not been guilty of some wrongdoing.)

I asked Mr. Goldwater if he had changed since 1964. No, he said, the change has taken place in the attitude of the country. The people have come around to his point of view; they have finally seen what he was driving at. Maybe he is right. The country has changed, and in some ways it has moved closer to his point of view. For example, the second Reconstruction has clearly run out of steam. It can surely be said that the nation is now moving at a Goldwater pace on the race issue. It is probably true that liberal attitudes have changed on some subjects, too. Liberal newspapers that were editorially optimistic about the Soviet Union in 1964 because of Premier Khrushchev's liberal policies are now filled with Goldwater-like pessimism over the Soviet leadership's treatment of Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn.

But if the world has changed, so has Mr. Goldwater. Ten years ago, he wanted to send the Marines to settle a dispute with Fidel Castro. Now he no longer talks about Cuba. He feels that Castro and Cuban Communism have lost their appeal and are no longer a threat, politically or economically, to the Western hemisphere.

While he was talking of withdrawing dip-

lomatic recognition from the Soviet Union in 1964, in 1974 he favors détente. "I don't think we've obtained it," he adds. "I think we're quite a ways from it." He still believes the West should strive to keep an advantage over the Communist countries but he says the world has changed in the last 10 years. The Soviet Union, for example, is now capable of keeping an occasional treaty, he says, while in the old days it almost never kept one. Also, he feels that the Soviet leaders now fear China much more than they fear the United States, and that this change has made them less dangerous to us at the moment. But that could change again and we must not let our guard down, he says.

He advocated pulling out of the United Nations in 1964 if mainland China was admitted. Now he applauds Mr. Nixon's *rapprochement* with the Chinese. "We're not salted into any position," Tony Smith, his press aide, explained. "Barry Goldwater is as entitled to change his mind as Bill Fulbright is to change his."

The Senator has even changed his mind about the Republican party's Eastern Establishment. Not just Nelson A. Rockefeller—who has met Goldwater at least half way in his ideology—but the whole Dewey-Javits-Wall Street Eastern seaboard that he once advocated, about half in jest, sawing off and floating out to sea. When I asked him if he saw any merit in establishing a national Conservative party, he said no, there was no point; the Republican party could handle the job.

"My personal feeling is, I no longer feel that a Republican has to be a conservative," he said. "I can live with Jack Javits." He conceded that that meant he had changed his mind "to some extent. I used to get very angry about Republicans who would not vote down the party line. But the longer I stayed around here in the East, the more I realized that living in these big Eastern cities and these big Eastern states was a little different from living out in the Middle West and the Far West. I couldn't get elected in New York City. I don't work politics that way. On the other hand, I don't think Jack Javits could get elected in Phoenix, 'cause he doesn't do it my way." He chuckled.

Of course, the big change of mind that has most endeared him to his old liberal enemies is his new hard line on Richard Nixon. He and Mr. Nixon had been publicly reconciled to each other for many years. There was some conflict between them in the early days, back when Mr. Nixon was working closely with the hated Eastern Establishment. Many probably have forgotten that Mr. Goldwater was the only threat to Mr. Nixon's Presidential nomination at the 1960 Republican convention. But that minor opposition was quickly forgotten and Mr. Goldwater joined in campaigning for the party's nominee that year. Whatever bitterness might have remained between the two men probably was dissipated further after Mr. Goldwater's defeat of the party's Eastern Establishment and his capture of the 1964 convention.

"We made it sort of the Western Establishment," he said with a satisfied grin. "I don't know if it's any better, but conservatives have dominated and have retained control, which is all right with me." Perhaps it was that confidence in the firmness of conservative control of the party that made Mr. Goldwater feel free to criticize President Nixon when the President moved too slowly to suit him on Watergate. Or perhaps it was simply a feeling that his personal standards of honesty and decency had been violated. Whatever it was, he began to speak his mind on the President early last year and he has continued to do so.

"He is a loner—the most complete loner I've ever known in any profession or business," he said during our first interview. "He doesn't seek the advice of those people

who've had a lot of political experience. Who he does get advice from, I have no idea. I haven't had a long talk with him since Thanksgiving last year [1972]. I went up to Camp David and we spent about three hours just chatting about things and he told me about changes in personnel and things like that.

"The President is not a warm man, outwardly. Yet, you get him with a few of the boys and get him to take a drink and, hell, he loosens right up. I wish he did more of that." Goldwater said he had tried to persuade the President's men to get him to relax. "When Laird went in there, I said, 'Mel, the one thing you can do for this guy is have him do what Eisenhower used to do.' Maybe once a month or once every six weeks the phone would ring about 5 o'clock and say, 'Hey, what are you doing?' 'Nothing.' 'Well, on your way home, drop in and we'll have a drink.' So we'd go upstairs in the living room and there might be four, five, six or a dozen. Now the purpose of that meeting was either to let the President blow off steam or let us blow off steam. And he'd say, 'O.K., what's bugging you?' And you'd sound off. If Nixon would do this, I think it would be a great help to him. . . . He doesn't have the intimate touch. I don't care what you're president of, when you're a leader you have to have rapport with your troops."

How about Mr. Nixon's famous "cool"; does he really have it? "I think he's cool. I've never, I don't think I've ever seen him get mad. I've heard him swear a lot but not in madness. Say, 'That son of a bitch shouldn't have done that,' or something like that."

He said the President telephoned him recently in Arizona to thank him for backing him at one point on the Watergate controversy. "I acknowledged it and I said, 'now, Mr. President, I have one request to make of you. Don't make another speech. I don't know who your writer is, but they're no good.' I said, 'When you want to talk to the press, you want to get something across, call the press in and have a go at it; nobody can beat you at it.' Subsequently, of course, Nixon did submit to public questioning several times.

There might be elements of personal affront in Mr. Goldwater's coolness toward the President. His son, Barry Jr., is a close friend and old schoolmate of John Dean, the apostate and former White House lawyer. Mr. Dean and young Goldwater were on the swimming team together at Staunton Military Academy. The Senator himself is not close to Mr. Dean but it is said he saw him at least once at his son's house and advised him to "tell it straight" when he testified before the Senate Watergate committee.

In addition, the Senator is said to be "not especially happy" about the cool treatment the White House has given Richard Kleindienst, the short-time Attorney General, and other Goldwater friends in the Nixon Administration. And if the White House felt that hiring Dean Burch, the former Goldwater campaign aide and chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, as a White House staffer would soften Mr. Goldwater, then the President and his people were being naive, according to Mr. Goldwater's people. Within days after Mr. Burch was hired in February, the President invited Mr. Goldwater to a White House political meeting along with the Republican leadership of Congress. He turned down the invitation. Goldwater does not favor impeachment of the President but his mind is open on resignation. He does not think the President should resign unless he makes "calamitous mistakes" even more damaging than those made so far. Beyond that, Goldwater does not like to discuss the question.

Probably his most telling comment on the

President was something not quite stated. I mentioned the talk in some circles that Mr. Nixon had quietly "torpedoed" Vice President Agnew and forced him to resign. Mr. Goldwater pointedly did not disagree with that theory. He said, "I think it's too early for anybody to say. If you want to wait around until I die, I've written what I thought took place and it's sealed up in my papers. It can't be used. I could write a beautiful scenario on that and come up with exactly what happened." I told him I would love to see it. He laughed and said, "I know you would. I'm not going to talk about it. 'Cause you can't prove it at all."

This is all very pleasing to liberals. And yet, none of it means that old-time liberal Democrats are taken in by the new Goldwater, any more than Mr. Goldwater is deceived by the meaning of his new popularity. "With most Americans," he said, "they like honesty. I think sometimes they get confused. They find a fellow who will tell the truth all the time and be candid and they think of themselves as liking him when it may not be that at all. It may be just a feeling of respect and that sort of thing."

No one is likely to confuse Mr. Goldwater's prodding of President Nixon with any deep ideological conversion. Liberals know that he still scores zero in the Americans for Democratic Action ratings; that in 1973, for example, he voted against Federal money for transit, against halting the import of Russian chrome and against reducing the Pentagon's money for the Trident submarine, that he voted for limiting busing for school desegregation and for weakening the minimum wage law. They know, too, that in all of his criticism of Mr. Nixon over the years, he still supports him on almost everything else.

Government spending still disturbs him. President Nixon's \$300-billion budget alarms him just as much as President Johnson's \$200-billion one did. He still believes the Government has grown too large. The "welfare mess" makes him see red, as does the booming crime rate. But while he still describes himself as conservative, he also likes to play the no-label game, as some liberals do nowadays. "I've always said that when history is written, Bob Taft and I will be called liberals," he said. "My hero of American politics was Thomas Jefferson, who in my opinion was a real liberal. And when you lay a real liberal alongside a real conservative, there's not enough difference to put in your hat."

"The major difference is that the conservative tends to rely always on history for the lessons of today and tomorrow, while the liberal will look at history and remember what happened but is willing to take a try once again at doing something even though it might have failed in the past. But the moment they find that they're wrong they'll come back. But the so-called modern liberal doesn't do that. I don't call a man liberal just because he wants to spend more money to supposedly help more people. It hasn't worked that way."

Very few of the "so-called modern liberals" would have trouble restraining themselves from pulling the Goldwater lever in the voting booth if he should run for President again. Not that he is likely to do that, in spite of the new talk.

"As I said down in Kentucky the other night—somebody asked the question, said, 'What if you were offered the nomination?' and I said, 'Well, any man who says he wouldn't take it is a damned liar.' But I won't do anything to encourage anybody. I will do everything to encourage them not to and I don't really think there will be any effort made. We have three good candidates looming now, Connally, Rockefeller and Reagan. I can support any one of them and would enjoy supporting any one of them."

But what about the old hunger for the Presidency? Is it gone? "Tell you the truth,

it was never really there," he said. "When Jack Kennedy was killed—I looked forward to running against Jack. And we used to talk about it. We had a hell of a good idea that I think would have helped American politics. We wouldn't necessarily live together but we would travel together as much as possible and appear on the same platform and express our views."

After Mr. Kennedy's assassination, he said, he decided not to run. Then it appeared that the Rockefeller people and the Easterners would take over the party so he got back in the race. "But it never was life or death for me."

He says the idea of his running for President again is usually raised by young people. He spends as much time as any conservative spokesman on the college lecture circuit. Of 10 speaking engagements he had in November, seven were on campuses. He is no longer invited exclusively by conservative campus groups. Many of his appearances now are open to all students, and his staff says he draws large numbers of all political persuasions. He gets several invitations to speak at commencements each year. The Senator reports increasing agreement with his views among students.

"I have a group or two every week in this office," he said. "I will answer their questions and I won't have answered but three or four and one of them will say, 'Now, wait a minute. You're a conservative, and I don't classify myself but I'm agreeing with you.' The young especially like his criticisms of the government," he said. "This, I think, is the central theme of the young people."

He has also found a revival of courtesy on campuses. Our first interview took place a few days before he was to speak at Western Kentucky University. "I remember the last time I was there, it was a little rough," he said. "And so was the University of Kentucky. This has all changed. I never get any bad treatment any place. Man, I used to have kids get up and shout 'Bull!' and walk up and down with dirty signs. But the campus has changed completely. These kids, they know what they're there for now."

Nonetheless, enthusiasm for Goldwater among the young is still a little puzzling. I suspect that the explanation for it goes beyond new standards of courtesy on campus or deep beliefs in limited government. There have been numerous indications that students are no longer much interested in government of any kind, limited or otherwise. Back in 1964, James Reston may have revealed the secret of Goldwater's appeal, not only to the young but also to many others who had with yearning and hope, but like some other good comment and analysis of that year, it got lost in the national panic as people ran over each other to get out of the way of the Goldwater menace: "Mr. Goldwater may attract all the ultras, and the antis—the forces that are anti-Negro, anti-labor, anti-foreigner, anti-intellectual—but he also attracts something else that is precisely the opposite of these vicious and negative forces. Mr. Goldwater touches the deep feeling of regret in American life: regret over the loss of religious faith; regret over the loss of simplicity and fidelity; regret over the loss of the frontier spirit of pugnacious individuality; regret, in short, over the loss of America's innocent and idealistic youth."

We now seem to be in another of our periodic spasms of regret over lost innocence. And who in our battered and depleted cadre of political leaders is better equipped to symbolize that loss and regret than square-shouldered, all-American Barry Goldwater? The man is easy to like. Remember how he behaved after he lost the 1964 election—43 million votes to 27 million. Unlike Richard Nixon, the grudge fighter and wound licker who found defeat almost intolerable, Barry Goldwater simply said to hell with it. If the

country did not want him, he would go back to his ham radio and his flying. He would rather occupy his mind with inventing an electronic flag-raising machine than with scratching his way back into power in Washington.

And how perceptions change! If he was the Bela Lugosi of American politics in 1964, he has now become the Henry Higgins. Since he has begun to prosper politically again, he is almost cranky about it. He showed me a huge stack of fan mail and said it had come from every state in the union. "My biggest trouble is keeping up with the damned stuff," he said. His voice had the same good-natured but put-upon tone when he talked of having to run all over the country making speeches, trouble-shooting for the party, educating the young, straightening out the President. He was trying to tell me that he was an ordinary man who desires nothing more than just the ordinary chance to live exactly as he likes and do precisely what he wants.*

What, after all, is his politics? It never has been one of engagement, of getting this country moving again. It is a politics of indignation. He looks up from his work table where he is minding his own business and here comes the goddamned Government, meddling with him. It is a politics of defense, of outraged sensitivity, of the violated citizen who just wants to live exactly as he likes.

But wasn't he a threat to the country in 1964? That San Francisco convention hall full of yahoos, haters and nuts was no joke. And he was there with them, taking their cheers and by his mere presence and station egging them on. By God, there was a smell of fascism in the air. It was no less real that it came from the Indians and not from the chief, and the chief stood by and did nothing to stop it.

And yet, there is still unfairness in the judgment if it stops there. Because as scary as that convention was, it was not scary in the same way a George Wallace rally is when the fevers are running high in Birmingham or Meridian or Flint. The difference is in the build of the men at the top. Wallace is a born and bred demagogue. When he finds passion in a crowd he makes blood contact with it, riding it, prodding it, lashing it to his own and thus giving both passions for a moment more power than any two passions singly and separately could ever achieve. George Wallace is a creature of political lust, and if it is hard to distinguish his politics from his sexuality, that is no accident. He is in the great tradition of hungry men who make no distinctions among their appetites.

Goldwater is different. Words like lust and passion do not fit him. His listeners like him but they do not yearn to go to bed with him or he with them. While Wallace is a demagogue, Goldwater is merely a crowd pleaser.

There is no doubt that Barry Goldwater wanted to be President, but I think he is truthful when he says he never lusted for it. Perhaps the voters sensed that. And perhaps that is why they rejected him so decisively, as some women instinctively reject a man when they sense that he is not blood-bonded in his determination.

The instinct is probably sound. It eliminates the frivolous, both in love and politics. Nevertheless, I am still fretful over the way we treated Barry Goldwater that year. It troubles me that we all stood by and let a man who was merely wrongheaded be portrayed to the world as monstrous. When I went to mark my ballot in 1964, I was not asked to vote rationally; I was asked to be-

* From "I'm an Ordinary Man," in "My Fair Lady." Copyright 1956 by Frederick Loewe and Alan Jay Lerner. Used by permission of Chappell & Co. Inc.

lieve only that Barry Goldwater was a dangerous man. I bought it and thereby let myself be cheated.

FEDERAL ELECTION CAMPAIGN ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1974

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill (S. 3044) to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to provide for public financing of primary and general election campaigns for Federal elective office, and to amend certain other provisions of law relating to the financing and conduct of such campaigns.

AMENDMENT NO. 1141

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 1141 and ask it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 13, line 23, strike out "10 cents" and insert in lieu thereof "5 cents".

On page 15, line 9, strike out "15 cents" and insert in lieu thereof "10 cents".

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, according to the unanimous consent agreement heretofore made, I offer a modification to the amendment, and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The modification will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 13, line 23, strike out "10 cents" and insert in lieu thereof "8 cents".

On page 15, line 9, strike out "15 cents" and insert in lieu thereof "12 cents".

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, does the distinguished Senator from Alabama wish to speak on his amendment this evening?

Mr. ALLEN. No. I understand that the time limitation will be stated on it tomorrow.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Very well. I thank the Senator.

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR AIKEN TOMORROW

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that after the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. PROXMIRE) has been recognized under the order previously entered on tomorrow, the distinguished Senator from Vermont (Mr. AIKEN) be recognized for not to exceed 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, it is my understanding that there is a time limitation on the Allen amendment as modification of 1 hour?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. It is my understanding also that the order for the resumption of the consideration of the unfinished business at the conclusion of routine morning business tomorrow has already been entered?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. It is also my understanding that the pending ques-

tion at that time will be on adoption of the amendment of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. ALLEN) as modified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from West Virginia yield?

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. ALLEN. May I state in brief just what the amendment and the modification will do. The amendment would have changed the permissible amount of money to be spent in a primary from 10 cents per person of voting age to 5 cents, and to change the amount that could be spent in a general election from 15 cents down to 10 cents.

The distinguished Senator from Nevada (Mr. CANNON) stated in colloquy on the floor that he felt these reductions were too large, but if the amendment was submitted at 8 cents per person of voting age in the primary and 12 cents per person of voting age in the general election, he personally—but not speaking for the committee—would support such an amendment.

The overall amount that can be spent would control the amount of the Federal subsidy in the primary because the Federal Treasury potentially would be called upon to pay half that amount and it would of course reduce the amount that the Public Treasury would pay for the general election. Overall, it would accomplish about a 20 percent reduction in overall expenditures. It would be a possible saving of as much as \$100 million every 4 years. So the modification has been made. It would accomplish a 20 percent reduction in the permissible amount of overall expenditures. I hope that on

tomorrow the Senate will accept the amendment.

PROGRAM

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, the program for tomorrow is as follows: The Senate will convene at 12 noon.

After the 2 leaders or their designees have been recognized under the standing order, Mr. PROXMIER will be recognized for not to exceed 15 minutes. Mr. ALLEN will then be recognized for not to exceed 15 minutes, after which there will be a period for the transaction of routine morning business, of not to exceed 15 minutes, with statements therein limited to 5 minutes each.

At the conclusion of the transaction of routine morning business, the Senate will resume consideration of the unfinished business, S. 3044, the public campaign financing bill.

The pending question at that time will be on the adoption of the amendment, as modified, by Mr. ALLEN. There will be a yea and nay vote on that amendment. The vote will occur at approximately 1:45 p.m.

Other votes on amendments may occur subsequent to the vote on that amendment and prior to 3 p.m.

At 3 p.m., the debate on the motion to invoke cloture will begin, and there will be 1 hour under the rule. The hour will expire at 4 p.m. At that time, the mandatory quorum call will be issued; and upon the establishment of a quorum, the vote, which will be a rollcall vote, will occur at approximately 4:15 p.m.

Subsequent to the vote on cloture, votes on amendments to the bill will be in order, and yea-and-nay votes will occur.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and at 5:12 p.m. the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, April 9, 1974, at 12 noon.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 8, 1974:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

John P. Constandy, of the District of Columbia, to be Deputy Inspector General, Foreign Assistance, vice Anthony Faunce, resigned.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for temporary appointment to the grade of brigadier general:

John R. Debarr	John H. Miller
Herbert J. Blaha	Harold A. Hatch
Philip D. Shutler	Edward J. Bronars
Richard E. Carey	Warren R. Johnson
George W. Smith	Paul X. Kelley

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate April 8, 1974:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Richard L. Feltner, of Illinois, to be an Assistant Secretary of Agriculture.

(The above nomination was approved subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.)